REMARKS

Claim 2 was canceled previously. Claims 1, 9, and 16 have been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 1 and 3-20 are pending.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 3-20 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raith in view of O'Connell.

The rejection is respectfully traversed. With respect to claims 1, 9, and 16 Raith describes sending a signal from a mobile phone network to a mobile phone to reset a "B key" on the mobile phone to a default or other value. Raith, col. 30, lines 38-54. The signal is sent and therefore the B key value is reset by the mobile network provider, not by a user of the mobile phone having a required level of privilege with respect to the phone such that the key is reset to a default value "without intervention of a provider with which the computer program is associated," as recited in claims 1, 9, and 16. In addition, the signal taught by Raith is not a "flag" within the meaning of the claim because it is not a stored value that is subsequently read to determine whether it has been set to a value indicating that the key should be reset to the default value, as recited in the claim.

O'Connell describes a challenge question – response mechanism for resetting a lost password, in which a previously established question is asked (e.g., what is your mother's maiden name) and the password is reset if the correct (previously provided and stored) response is given. O'Connell col. 1, lines 44-53. A challenge question and response are not the same thing as "setting a flag" by storing a value and subsequently reading the stored value to determine whether it has been set to a value indicating the password is to be reset, as recited in claims 1, 9, and 16.

Providing a challenge question – response mechanism to enable a user to cause a password to be reset, as taught by O'Connell, and sending a signal from a provider network to reset a mobile phone B key as taught by Raith, are not the same as enabling a user having a prescribed level of privileged with respect to a *computer* on which a computer program is running to use the privileged user status with respect to the computer to reset a key associated with the *computer program* as recited in claims 1, 9, and 16. As such, claims 1, 9, and 16 are believed to be allowable.

Claims 3-8 which depend from claim 1, claims 10-15 which depend from claim 9, and claims 17-20 which depend from claim 16 are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

The foregoing amendments are not to be taken as an admission of unpatentability of any of the claims prior to the amendments.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks. If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Theodore A. Chen

Dated: 2/27/08

Theodore A. Chen
Registration No. 40,557
V 925-600-5681
F 925-600-5682

EMC Corporation